

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

*Please replace Figures 8-10 and 12-17 with revised Figures 8-10 and 12-17
(9 sheets), attached hereto.*

REMARKS

A. Amendments to the specification

The specification has been amended throughout to introduce appropriate sequence identifiers as required. Applicant has also replaced the sequence listing of record with a substitute sequence listing, which has been amended to include previously disclosed SEQ ID NOS: 12-14 and update the file reference number.

Accompanying the paper copy of the substitute sequence listing is a “Statement Pursuant 37 C.F.R. § 1.821.” Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification or sequence listing.

B. Amendments to the drawings

Figures 8-10 and 12-17 are being replaced with revised figures 8-10 and 12-17 (9 sheets), attached hereto, to include sequence identification numbers as required. No new matter is added by the amendments to the drawings.

C. Response to requirement for further election of species

In response to the Examiner’s allegation that Applicant’s communication filed on February 26, 2009 was not fully responsive to the communication mailed December 26, 2008, Applicant respectfully disagrees. For the record, this is the third restriction requirement mailed by the Patent Office, and neither the previous communication from the Patent Office, mailed December 26, 2008, nor the restriction requirement imposed April 8, 2008, indicated or stated that Applicant must elect a specific substituent for the Cys residue in SEQ ID NO: 10.

In response, therefore, Applicant elects, with traverse, “Abu” as the specific substituent for the Cys residue in SEQ ID NO: 10. Applicant maintains that the newly

identified aspects of the claims do not impose a significant search and examination burden on the Examiner. Moreover, Applicant submits for the record that the time periods of delay necessitated by the Patent Office's supplemental restrictions should not be counted against Applicant's patent term, as the previous two restriction requirements did not impose the presently required election.

D. Conclusion

In view of the above election, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for examination and allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions or concerns.

Dated: July 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Lynn L Janulis/53,066
Lynn L. Janulis
Registration No.: 53,066
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant